

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 9, 18, 19, 25, 29 and 30 are in independent form. Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 18-30 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 15 and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, with no change in scope. Those claims have not been so rewritten because, for the reasons given below, their respective base claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 1, 9 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,094,218 (Suzuki et al.). Claims 2-8, 10-14, 19-21, 25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Suzuki* in view of U.S. Patent 5,995,201 (Sakaguchi), and Claims 22-24, as being unpatentable over *Suzuki* in view of *Sakaguchi* and U.S. Patent 5,404,853 (Miyaza).

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus that comprises image obtaining means for obtaining a second image of a predetermined aspect size ratio from a first image on the basis of an aspect size ratio of said first image, and reducing means for reducing the second image so obtained. Also provided are associating means for associating the second image with the first image.

According to each of the independent claims, as in Claim 1, the reduced image is associated with the former (original) image even if the aspect ratio of the original image is different from the aspect ratio of the reduced image. For example, as illustrated shown in Figs. 7 and 9, even though the aspect ratio of the original image is different from

that of the reduced image, these images are associated with each other as corresponding images. (It is of course to be understood that any references to the preferred embodiments are for illustration only, and that the claim scope is not limited by the details of those embodiments.)

Suzuki relates to a system in which a trimming process is performed on a scanned image, on the basis of trimming information recorded on a magnetic recording area of the film, and the trimming-processed image is displayed to enable a user to confirm what the processed image looks like (see Fig. 10, for example). Nothing has been found or pointed out in *Suzuki*, however, that would teach or suggest means for associating a reduced image with a first image, from which the second image was made, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Suzuki*.

Each of the other independent claims is believed also to be allowable that patent, for at least the same reason.

Sakaguchi relates to a printer usable with several film sizes. That is, in *Sakaguchi*, when trimming is performed, the user designates the trimming area while watching a reference line in an image displayed on a monitor. Then, the optical magnifying power and the electronic magnifying power are set according to the trimming operation. In addition, in *Sakaguchi* members 180 and 166 respectively including the film reading units abut each other (column 10, lines 29-33), and the film is rotated if necessary when the trimming is performed (column 15, lines 25-36).

However, nothing has been found or pointed out in *Sakaguchi* that would teach or suggest the above feature of the independent claims, that a reduced image is associated with a first (original) image.

Applicant notes that the portions of *Sakaguchi* specifically referred to in the Office Action (column 23, lines 16-22, and column 24, lines 50-67) merely describe that the effective pixel region of the CCD is inscribed in the mask opening region for the trimming process. This is not seen in any way to suggest the mentioned features of the claims. Similarly, the portion of *Sakaguchi* quoted with reference to Claim 5 merely describes negative/positive conversion and the hardware structure of the trimming device, and is not seen to relate in any way to the mentioned features of the claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29 286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 402599 v1